DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 030 939 EA 001 704

By-Brademas, John; Quie, Albert H.

The Shape of Federal Funding for Tomorrow's Schools.

Pub Date Feb 68

Note-33p.; Pages 69-97 in YOUR AASA IN NINETEEN SIXTY-SEVEN-SIXTY-EIGHT, OFFICIAL REPORT, INCLUDING A RECORD OF THE ANNUAL CONFERENCE (100th, Atlantic City, N.J., Feb. 17-21, 1968).

Available from-American Association of School Administrators, 1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 ($3.00).

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC Not Available from EDRS.

Descriptors-Debate, *Education, *Educational Needs, Educational Planning, Equal Education, *Federal Aid, Federal Legislation, *Federal Programs, Federal State Relationship, Resource Allocations, State Church Separation, State Departments of Education, *State Federal Aid, Urban Schools

Identifiers-Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, ESEA

This chapter reports the positions taken by two U.S. Congressmen during their debate over the most effective method available for distributing Federal funds to the nation's schools. U.S. Representative John Brademas defends Federal categorical grant programs as the most realistic means for allocating scarce Federal resources to those areas faced with the nation's most pressing educational problems. Congressman Albert H. Quie contends that the distribution of Federal funds through block grants to each of the States would enable each State educational agency to plan for the most effective use of resources in satisfying the educational needs within its jurisdiction. Both Congressmen advocate a larger total investment in education to match the nation's commitment to educational improvement. (JH)

EDO 30939

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

YOUR AASA

in nineteen sixty-seven=sixty-eight

OFFICIAL REPORT

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF

SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

INCLUDING A RECORD OF THE
ONE HUNDREDTH ANNUAL CONFERENCE
ATLANTIC CITY, NEW JERSEY
FEBRUARY 17-21, 1968

PROCESS WITH MICROFICHE AND PUBLISHER'S PRICES. MICROFICHE REPRODUCTION ONLY.

CONFERENCE HEADQUARTERS
ATLANTIC CITY CONVENTION HALL

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted work has been granted to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) and to the organization operating under contract with the Office of Education to reproduce documents included in the ERIC system by means of microfiche only, but this right is not conferred to any users of the microfiche received from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service. Further reproduction of any part requires permission of the copyright owner.

EA001704

AASA

Official Report

copyright 1968 by the
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS
1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C.

Organized in 1865

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 9-4525
Price, $3

our policy The American Association of School Administrators endorses no individual or group of individuals or any sentiment by any speaker or other participant in its program, except by resolution or by motion approved by a vote of its members.

CONTENTS

		PAGE
Officers and Staff, 1967-68		4

1968 Annual Conference

The Problem of Violence	*Moynihan*	5
Golden Key Awards Presented to Whitney M. Young, Jr., LaMont H. Lawson	*Hanson*	19
Education and the Racial Crisis: Challenge and Opportunity	*Young*	24
The Role of Responsible Dissent	*Sachar*	31
It Was the Best of Times; It Was the Worst of Times	*McGill*	41
The Evolution of Stars and Life	*Jastrow*	52
Recognition of Mrs. Ruth H. Mancuso	*Curtis*	63
The Shape of Federal Funding for Tomorrow's Schools	*Brademas, Quie*	69
Recognition of the President of the National Education Association	*Miller*	98
Much Has Been Done; Much Remains To Be Done	*Freeman*	102
Recognition of Mrs. Elizabeth Hendryson	*Curtis*	114
Distinguished Service Awards Presented to George S. Counts, Joe L. Gettys, Kenneth E. Oberholtzer, Guy B. Phillips	*Curtis*	118
The President, the Power, and the Peace	*Sevareid*	122
Introduction of Incoming President John L. Miller	*Curtis*	140
Past President's Key and Plaque Presented to William H. Curtis	*Engleman*	142
The Frustrations of Progress	*Howe*	145
Shankland, McClure, Engleman Scholarships Presented by Associated Exhibitors to Harmon A. Baldwin, Erwin N. Jones, Russell W. Meyers	*McChesney*	157
Presentation of the American Education Award to Bob Hope	*McChesney*	159
The American Education Award for 1968 (text)		160
Acceptance of the American Education Award	*Hope*	161

Official Records

Annual Report of the Executive Secretary	165
Report of the Resolutions Committee	198
Report of the Board of Tellers	213
Report of the Audit Committee	214
The Constitution and Bylaws	218
The Platform	224
History	227
Calendar of Meetings	229
Index of Names	235

Officers and Staff, 1967-68

American Association of School Administrators

President
William H. Curtis, Superintendent of Schools, Manchester, Conn.

President-Elect
John L. Miller, Superintendent of Schools, Great Neck, N.Y.

Vice-President
Paul A. Miller, Superintendent of Schools, Cincinnati, Ohio

Executive Committee
John W. Letson, Superintendent of Schools, Atlanta, Ga.
Arnold W. Salisbury, Superintendent of Schools, Cedar Rapids, Iowa
Harold H. Eibling, Superintendent of Schools, Columbus, Ohio
John B. Geissinger, Superintendent of Schools, Tenafly, N.J.
William E. Bishop, Superintendent of Schools, Englewood, Colo.
E. C. Stimbert, Superintendent of Schools, Memphis, Tenn.
The President, President-Elect, and Vice-President (ex officio)

Executive Secretary
Forrest E. Conner, 1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C.

Secretary Emeritus
Finis E. Engleman, 115 South Fernwood Avenue, Pitman, N.J.

Deputy Executive Secretary
William J. Ellena, 1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C.

Associate Secretaries
Robert M. Isenberg, 1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C.
James R. Kirkpatrick, 1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C.
Stephen J. Knezevich, 1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C.
George B. Redfern, 1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C.

The Shape of Federal Funding For Tomorrow's Schools

THE HONORABLE JOHN BRADEMAS
United States Representative from Indiana

THE HONORABLE ALBERT H. QUIE
United States Representative from Minnesota

PRESIDENT CURTIS: In the past decade or so, educators have been much more active in the world of politics—not only at the state level but in the last few years at the national level as well. Let me assure you that our Association has been active at the national level through its professional staff, through the work of the Executive Committee, and especially through the work of our Special Committee on Federal Policy and Legislation under the able chairmanship of Warren Phillips of Valparaiso, Indiana. If you do not know this, I think you should, that within a few days there will be another associate secretary added to our staff, Jim Kirkpatrick. He along with other members of the professional staff will be in liaison with the Congress and with the United States Office of Education even more. Because of the growing part of the federal government in educational programs, the topic which has been chosen for tonight's discussion, "The Shape of Federal Funding for Tomorrow's Schools," seems especially appropriate.

We have many friends in the Congress and our two guests tonight we count as two of our very special friends. Our Committee has enjoyed a very fine liaison with these gentlemen, as with other members of the United States Congress.

The rules that have been established tonight are simple. One of the men will make a presentation, followed by the second; then in the same order, there will be a ten-minute rebuttal by each.

The flip of a coin has determined which of these men will go first. A coin was tossed in the back of the stage a few minutes ago, and Congressman Quie won the toss. Guess who goes first!

EA001 704

And they tell me that this is most appropriate because Congressman Quie and Congressman Brademas indicated that the last time Mr. Quie had to go first. So with that, I start out with the introduction of Congressman John Brademas, who will lead the parade.

Congressman Brademas' Presentation

PRESIDENT CURTIS: Congressman Brademas of Indiana is serving his fifth term as a member of the United States Congress. Important assignments of his include membership on the House Committee on Education and Labor and the subcommittees involving General and Special Education and Special Labor, also membership on the Committee on House Administration.

In 1966 he served as chairman of the Task Force on International Education. Significant sponsorship in Congress includes the International Education Act of 1966, the Teacher Fellowship and Teacher Corps Programs of 1965, the Technical Education Program of 1963, the Juvenile Delinquency Act of 1961, cosponsorship of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, the Higher Education Act, the Vocational Education Act, and the Peace Corps Act.

As a member of Congress, he has rendered service not only at the national level but also at the international level. During the past few years important assignments have included participation as a member of various delegations to countries in Europe including the Soviet Union, Asia, and South America.

Congressman Brademas has a B.A. degree from Harvard University, magna cum laude; recognition and election to Phi Beta Kappa as a Veteran's National Scholar.

In addition, he has a graduate degree from Oxford University in England. He went there as the Rhodes Scholar from Indiana.

The important experiences which make Congressman Brademas especially well qualified for his current assignment include service as administrative assistant to United States Representative Ashley, Democrat from Ohio; legislative assistant to United States Senator McNamara from Michigan; executive assistant to Adlai Stevenson; and service as assistant professor of political science, St. Mary's College, Notre Dame, Indiana, 1957-58.

Four institutions of higher learning, namely, Columbia College, Chicago; St. Mary's College, Notre Dame, Indiana; Brandeis University of Massachusetts; and Middlebury College of Vermont—all—during the past years have seen fit to honor him with honorary degrees.

Congressman Brademas, on behalf of the audience and as president

of this association, I extend to you a warm welcome as the speaker at this Sixth General Session of our annual conference. [Applause]

CONGRESSMAN BRADEMAS: *Dr. Curtis, Mrs. Mancuso, Congressman Quie, Ladies and Gentlemen:* I am delighted and honored to be invited to participate in this conference for several reasons.

First, it brings me together with my distinguished colleague and good friend Al Quie of Minnesota. Al and I have sat on the House Committee on Education and Labor for nearly 10 years now and although we are not always in agreement on the legislation we consider —as our presence with you tonight indicates—there is no one on our committee or, indeed, in Congress more deeply dedicated to better education for Americans than he is.

I am glad to be here too to meet with the administrators of America's schools.

My late grandfather was a school principal and superintendent for many years in the towns and rural areas of central Indiana, and I learned from him that there is no nobler vocation than helping young people learn. In today's America, in my view, no one plays a more significant role in determining the future of tomorrow's America than do you, the men and women who run our nation's schools.

The final reason I am glad to be with you is the opportunity it affords me to talk about the contribution that our federal government can make to strengthening the schools of our country.

And I use the word *contribution* deliberately because it must be obvious to many of you that so many and so complex are the challenges facing the American people today in the fields of jobs, housing, health, pollution—as well as education—that we need the intelligent and energetic commitment of all the resources we can muster, public and private, federal and state and local, if we are to master these problems and not be overcome by them.

In particular, I believe we must strengthen both state and local government if they are to meet the responsibilities our changing society is thrusting upon them.

But let me make very clear at the outset of my remarks that though I believe there is a significant role for the federal government in support of education, I draw the line at sanitation. Even if Governor Rockefeller and Mayor Lindsay look with yearning eyes to Washington, I am strongly opposed to federal control of garbage [laughter]—and you can quote me on that. Or, does Al Quie have a block grant proposal for garbage disposal that he wants to advocate tonight? [Laughter]

But more seriously, let me give you just two examples of what I mean when I say that it is imperative that we strengthen state and local government in this country.

This week a subcommittee on which Al and I sit will hear testimony on several bills, one of which I introduced, the Public Service Education Act, aimed at encouraging highly talented young men and women to enter state and local government by providing them with fellowships for graduate study.

Because I feel so strongly about improving state and local government, I have also been a militant supporter of Title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which, as you know, is aimed at strengthening our state departments of education.

In fact, it was on my motion in the Education Committee that the Administration's original proposal in 1965 of $10 million for Title V was raised to $25 million—more than doubled—and in 1967 we increased still further the authorization to strengthen state education agencies.

Indeed, one can perhaps say that the chief importance of the federal financial assistance we have been providing to our nation's schools, especially through ESEA, is that it can help state and local communities do a better job of teaching than they could do without these funds.

And it is, therefore, significant that we no longer debate the legitimacy or wisdom of federal aid but rather the question of the best way to provide and administer it.

More federal money, not less, is the theme we in Congress hear from nearly all segments of the education community, including many groups formerly hostile to federal assistance to schools.

The National Congress of Parents and Teachers' legislative chairman wrote me only last week in support of a program whereby the federal government would subsidize 25 percent of the cost of public schools.

The Legislative Commission of the National Education Association just last month called for a "major escalation of the nation's commitment to quality education" and pressed for a $6 billion federal program to meet "urgent needs" in our elementary and secondary schools.

And I understand that your great organization has under consideration here at Atlantic City a resolution urging federal aid to guarantee a minimum per-pupil expenditure throughout the country.

So, we are no longer squeamish about accepting federal funds. We must now draw our attention to the question of how best to administer federal assistance to local and state school systems.

Some have framed this discussion in terms of two approaches: Should federal dollars be channeled in block grant form to the states or should federal funds be provided to help meet pressing national needs in education which are not being met effectively from local, state, and private sources?

My answer is that while general federal aid to education—aid not targeted on critical needs—may be a desirable objective which I hope we can achieve in the long run, it is imperative that we maintain for the present the prevailing pattern of categorical aid aimed at such needs. To dismantle, for example, the programs initiated under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and replace them with general unrestricted grants would seriously weaken our effort as a nation to get at our toughest educational problems.

Now, let me here list some of the myths upon which the case for so-called general aid to education has been developed.

The first myth is the notion that while categorical programs involve narrow categories of assistance encumbered with many restrictions, general aid offers flexibility and freedom from red tape.

But, in practice, no such clear distinction exists. Many federal categorical programs incorporate fewer limitations and are nearly as broad as many state general support or foundation programs. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act, for example, though directed at particular needs, is nevertheless extremely flexible in application and allows wide discretion to state and local authorities. In fact, the ESEA contains some of the most permissive authorizations in American legislative history. And I hear almost no complaints from school administrators in my state that federal agents are commanding them what to do in their schools.

On the other hand, state general aid programs are often replete with detailed *strings* on curriculum, salaries, class size, and number of teachers.

My point is that general aid provides no sure escape from bureaucratic disorder and red tape. Mr. Quie's own block grant proposal offered as an amendment to the ESEA last year illustrates the problem; his substitute bill was a far cry from general aid freely to be expended by the states. In its final form, the bill was honeycombed with conditions and restrictions that would dazzle the imagination of the hardest-core bureaucrat.

Now, let me assure you that I am sympathetic to the need for simplifying federal programs and I understand the problems you face in confronting an often untidy and confusing federal aid structure.

But the answer to the problem does not lie in a wholesale conversion to block grants.

Instead, we must seek to broaden, consolidate, and streamline existing categorical programs where appropriate. Congress and the Administration are now moving in this direction in a number of fields.

The second myth on which advocates of general aid frequently ground their case has to do with alleged *control* of education. The special purpose education programs passed by Congress in recent years, so goes the argument, must inevitably bring federal control of our schools and colleges.

But you and I know that policy making in education in the United States is so widely dispersed and so deeply inbedded in traditional American pluralism that effective control has never been—and never should be—concentrated in one institution or in one level of government.

After all, we do not really have a *system* of education in the United States at all, but rather a whole variety of systems, each with substantial autonomy. That the federal government or the Office of Education could exercise control over 25,000 school boards and 50 state education departments, even if it wished to do so, is highly unlikely.

Furthermore, it is important to note that the federal aid programs enacted in the past few years, far from limiting the role of state and local education agencies, have considerably enhanced their options and responsibilities. Indeed, the effectiveness of federal-aid-to-education programs depends fundamentally on initiative and creativity from local school systems themselves and on the capacity for leadership and coordination of the state education agencies.

The ESEA, in particular, places heavy responsibility at the grass roots. Title I compensatory programs are conceived and designed entirely at the local level and approved by state education agencies.

Title II, the textbook title, gives both state and local school systems new and valuable resources for learning; it does not cripple state and local leadership.

Title III, aimed at encouraging innovation, also stimulates initiative by local schools. The states, which have played a reviewing and recommending role up to now, will soon under the 1967 amendments take over control of Title III projects. Let us all hope that state education agencies will respond to this new opportunity with imagination and vigor. Some of us in Congress have frankly been dubious but hope we are proved wrong, and I can cite to you more than one local

school superintendent who prefers federal red tape to the kind manufactured in his state capitol!

Now, there are two other points that must be made with respect to the allegation of federal control.

First, the impetus for increased federal support of education has not come from heavy-handed, anonymous bureaucrats in Washington. It has been the elected representatives of the people from every state and locality in the nation in Congress assembled who have considered and enacted the new education programs. Federal aid to education derives from a nationwide mandate in Congress; it has not been ordained by federal administrators in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Second, the states, by law and custom, have primary responsibility for education, but historically the federal government has shown an interest in helping the states improve their educational systems. From the Northwest Ordinance of 1785 through the Morrill Act of 1862, the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917, and the GI Bill of World War II, the federal government, while clearly a junior partner in the educational enterprise, has sought to identify national needs in education and to help the states to meet them. My point here is that recent federal education measures, though substantially increasing the federal investment in education, represent no radical departure viewed in this historical perspective. The federal government is not—and should not be—seeking to take over state and local prerogatives. It is not making, in a much-quoted phrase, a power play to control education. Rather, the American people, acting through their elected President and Representatives in Congress, have again identified certain educational problems requiring attention on a nationwide basis and have determined to direct federal funds to help solve these problems.

So much then for the myths which I think cloud the discussion of general versus categorical aid. As I have indicated, I would not be unsympathetic to some form of block grants at a later date. Given the mounting cost of education, given the inadequate tax resources of local governments, to which Mrs. Mancuso made reference, and given the unwillingness of some state politicians to support funds for education (here a nod to Governor Kirk of Florida), it may be essential for the federal government to use its revenue capacity to underwrite the major expense of the nation's educational system. But let me outline some of the serious questions which I think must be raised before we can move ahead with the general aid approach.

First, it is the simple fact that we are in a period of serious retrench-

ment in federal expenditures. All the current education programs, from Head Start to college facility grants, are feeling the pinch. As long as education is on a tight budget, we clearly cannot afford both to continue financing categorical programs and to initiate general, across-the-board support. And as long as we cannot afford both, we must hold our focus on the programs already established to meet critical needs.

Consider the matter in these terms. In 1963-64, the federal government provided 4 percent of the costs of elementary and secondary education. In 1966-67, the federal share, largely as a result of the passage of ESEA, nearly doubled but nonetheless amounted to only 7.2 percent of the total funds expended.

If the increased federal investment of a little over 3 percent were lumped into block grants, it would simply be reflected in a slight percentage increase of each school operating budget, and the impact on special education needs would be inconsequential.

The effect of converting categorical programs to general aid reminds me of Mark Twain's description of the Platte River, six miles wide and a half-inch deep.

As it is, we are now spending only a bare minimum to support the categorical programs under ESEA. Dean Theodore Sizer of the Harvard Graduate School of Education has recently pointed out that the major programs in education are still operating on a marginal basis. I quote from his annual report:

> The federal government's entrance into educational reform, through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, was first seen as a modest start, a short step in anticipation of a longer one. The major provision was $1.2 billion directed at schooling for the children of poor families. While this sum sounds large, it averages out to $92 per "disadvantaged" child, a small increase, considering the need, above the $564 now being spent per American school child.

Dean Sizer notes there have been few startling results, either positive or negative, to date, "an unsurprising fact," he says, "considering the small scale of the effort and the short span of the experiment."

The annual report of the National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children made a similar point only a few days ago—that most projects for improving the education of poor children are spreading funds too thinly. Substantially more money is needed, said the Council. "The surface of this important work has been only lightly scratched."

To make general the federal aid that we are already providing would

therefore, in my view, only further reduce the possibility of achieving significant results.

Fiscal reality, then, requires that we postpone any move toward general aid in the immediate future. Only when federal funds are running more freely—perhaps only after Vietnam—can we seriously consider a program of block grants to education. But even at the point where we might have sufficient resources to undertake both categorical and block grants, there are several other problems that would need to be resolved. Here are some of the thorniest issues:

1. A renewal of strife over the church-state issue could pose a major dilemma. Controversies over this question contributed to the defeat of federal school aid for many years. The ESEA broke the deadlock in 1965 with the provision that parochial schoolchildren should share in the benefits of a number of publicly operated and administered programs.

Yet the constitutions of over 30 states explicitly prohibit the use of any state funds for the support, direct or indirect, of church-related schools. Block federal grants to the states, to be distributed not on a categorical basis but at the discretion of state agencies, could, therefore, raise anew the issue of religion. The result could be to create widespread discord and to vitiate the cooperative efforts between public and parochial schools that are now taking place under ESEA.

2. The question of school integration is still—13 years after Brown vs. the Board of Education of Topeka—the most sensitive problem, North as well as South, in American elementary and secondary education. And it is not secret that some members of Congress favor block grants to the states rather than categorical aid because they believe that the state-directed programs offer a more promising refuge from the school desegregation guidelines than do current programs.

Although compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act remains a condition of receiving federal funds for a wide spectrum of programs, of which education is only one, there is surely little justification for arguing that turning federal funds over to the states will make easier the effective implementation of either court decisions or legislative actions in resolving this most difficult dilemma in American life.

3. Another problem is that not all states have the capacity to administer effectively a substantial infusion of block grants. Testimony before Congressional committees has shown that many state education agencies are not yet sufficiently equipped with staff and other resources to take on such a major administrative responsibility. Some states do have this capacity and, with the help of Title V of

ESEA, the states are making significant efforts to strengthen their education departments. Nevertheless, serious personnel shortages and resistance to change still leave some state departments badly handicapped administratively.

4. And another point that, in my view, has received insufficient attention is that many chief state school officers—22, to be exact—are, like Al Quie and me, elected politicans, not solely professional educators. Turning over large sums of unrestricted federal money to state education officials who do not bear the burden at the polls of having voted for the taxes poses certain questions about responsible and democratic government.

5. A fifth problem: how to insure that state and local governments do not substitute federal block grant support for their own fiscal effort. If federal dollars merely replace state and local dollars, general aid will achieve no purpose. Only this month a federal court struck down as unconstitutional a law of the State of Virginia to reduce state assistance to its school districts receiving federal aid to impacted areas. Perhaps Virginia was demonstrating its devotion to states' rights. [Laughter]

6. But the most disturbing issue that the general-aid concept poses at this time is a subject which has, I understand, been much discussed at your conference so far this week. It is the traditional unresponsiveness of state governments to the overwhelming needs of urban school districts. State support for local schools is typically riddled with disparities between rural and urban areas, between city and suburb, and between suburbs themselves. Above all, distribution formulas for state aid have long been weighted against the cities, thereby short-changing urban children.

What hope, then, can we find in block grants to education channeled through the states? The most likely prospect is that such general aid would only magnify the inequities that already exist within the states.

A recent study by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, covering 37 metropolitan areas, shows clearly the tendency of state financial aid to favor suburban schools over central city schools. The Commission's study found that schools serving low-income central-city children are receiving less per pupil as well as less per capita than those serving the more affluent suburbs.

Hardly any state has yet sought to revise its school aid formulas to account for the relative financial requirements for educating different kinds of children—for example, disadvantaged as distinguished from middle-class children. Just as we spend a great deal extra for the

education of physically handicapped children, so we need to spend much more to educate children with economic and cultural handicaps. A program like Head Start is an attempt to compensate for the needs of the poor child; to pay for special services and smaller classes, Head Start makes an average per-pupil expenditure of $1200, compared with $600 or $700 for the suburban child. So far, the states have made no such effort to gear their financial aid programs to the needs of different children.

The president-elect of the University of Chicago, Edward H. Levi, has recently posed the following question: Are the inequities in the operation of state educational systems "to be justified because this is the way the ball bounces, that is, this is how state action happens to collect and happens to allocate funds for the education it requires of all"? Dr. Levi suggests that there may be a strong argument to be made for the unconstitutionality of certain aspects of state and local educational financing.

In fact, Levi's proposal is now being tested by the Detroit Board of Education, which has initiated what may be a landmark case concerning the issue of equity in the distribution of state school aid. The Detroit suit is aimed at compelling the State of Michigan to provide equal educational opportunity for all public school children in the state, even if this means unequal amounts of aid per child. The Detroit school board, basing its case on the Fourteenth Amendment provision that states grant equal protection of the laws to all citizens, maintains that equal opportunities in education require that state educational assistance be based upon the needs of each child and the costs of providing the required educational services.

The Detroit case could have an enormous impact upon traditional state practices in support of education.

Now, in all of this discussion, I do not mean to say that there have been no stirrings within the states themselves; that is not true. I was much encouraged by a report I saw recently of the Florida Commission for Quality Education. This Commission recommends that the State of Florida take over 75 percent of public school spending and that the tax burden for supporting the schools be equalized through statewide, uniform assessment of property for tax purposes.

But we have a long way to go before such essential measures are fully implemented in all of our states. Until the states have developed the capacity and willingness to deal with today's critical problems in education, general aid to the states will not be a sound proposition.

Indeed, what I have been discussing so far should help explain

the strong opposition of so many school superintendents in our larger cities to the 1967 efforts to replace categorical with general aid. These men, at the working level, at the day-to-day level, understand what general aid now would mean to them—profound trouble, not to say catastrophe. When, however, general aid does come as I hope it will, it should clearly be in addition to—not in place of—effective programs of categorical assistance.

To quote one of the great public servants of this century, John W. Gardner: "A strong federal government . . . must create flexible partnerships with state and local government and the private sector that throw the challenge back to the people and their local institutions. They can and should rise to the occasion; they can and should contribute solutions in their own style. I don't think many Americans today understand the extent to which much of recent legislation dealing with health, education, and poverty and the cities devolve initiative and operating responsibility to the grass roots."

I think Mr. Gardner is right, and I return in concluding to the theme with which I began these remarks. So manifold and difficult are the problems that beset Americans today that we need strong and imaginative leadership at every level—in education and elsewhere—from the grass roots, where you are, to our state and federal units of government.

Working together, and not at cross-purposes, we can make of American education what all of us want it to be—the foundation of our freedoms and the hope of our future.

Thank you. [Applause]

Congressman Quie's Presentation

PRESIDENT CURTIS: Minnesota Congressman Albert H. Quie, who is serving for a sixth term in the United States Congress, is recognized as one of the education experts in the House of Representatives. He is the second-ranking Republican on the House Education and Labor Committee.

Congressman Quie has played a major role in shaping educational legislation passed by Congress in recent years. He has long been an advocate of special education for culturally and socially disadvantaged preschool children. Representative Quie has also assumed a leading role in the writing of such legislation as the Higher Education Act of 1964 and the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1963, both important landmarks in United States educational legislation.

Current involvement includes a number of important efforts to

initiate certain changes in some of the educational legislation which has been enacted in recent years.

As coauthor of Opportunity Crusade, the Republican plan to revamp the Administration's War on Poverty, he has become a leading Republican spokesman on poverty. Congressman Quie has not limited his efforts to the field of education. For some time he has been recognized as a leading voice on behalf of agriculture in the Midwest. He was born and raised on a farm in Rice County near Dennison, Minnesota. He now owns it and continues to operate it.

Prior to service as a Congressman and while farming in Minnesota, Mr. Quie served as secretary of the Board of Supervisors of the Rice County Soil Conservation District, as a member of the Extension Board of Rice County, president of the Rice County Farm Bureau, and as a member of the board of education of that district. During World War II he served in the armed forces as a United States Navy pilot. After the war he enrolled at St. Olaf College. Majoring in political science, he was graduated from St. Olaf in 1950.

In 1954 he was elected to the Minnesota Senate. He served in the 1955 and 1957 sessions.

Special honors to come to the Congressman in recent years include the Distinguished Service Award of the Northfield, Minnesota, Junior Chamber of Commerce; the Young Man of the Year Award of the Minnesota Jaycees; and the Distinguished Alumni Award of St. Olaf College.

Congressman Quie, on behalf of this audience and as president of the Association, I extend to you a warm welcome as our other speaker at this Sixth General Session of our annual conference. [Applause]

CONGRESSMAN QUIE: Thank you, Dr. Curtis.

Mrs. Mancuso, My Colleague John Brademas, Ladies and Gentlemen: It is a pleasure and a privilege to be with you this evening and to have this opportunity to discuss what I believe must be the shape that federal funding must assume if we are to meet our greatest social responsibility—the education of our young people.

Traditionally, we have done more than merely pay lip-service to this responsibility: we have translated this abstract acceptance into classroom instruction that has been both a source of national pride and strength and the object of worldwide recognition and praise. Judged by prevailing education standards in other nations, judged by our needs in times that have passed, American education has received honor grades. The American people and the education community have a justifiable reason to be proud.

But today there is a growing awareness that in education what is past is not prologue. Today, the education spotlight focuses no longer on yesterday's accomplishments but rather on today's social ills—attributable in part at least to inadequacies and weaknesses, to failings within our education system. Dialogue within education circles has a tone of pessimism. American education is having serious difficulty in meeting our present needs. Predictions for the future are no more optimistic. Only some very major changes in attitude and in action will make it more flexible and more responsive to our rapidly changing needs. Only some very major changes will enable education to satisfy the growing and complex needs of the individual and of society.

The argument that we have not kept pace—but are falling farther and farther behind—is substantiated by mounting evidence that adds up to a swelling national education deficit.

Steady increases in the incidence of adult and juvenile crime, the perennial problems of the hard-core unemployed, school dropouts, a growing and uncontainable social frustration that no longer remains latent—all of these—coupled with a multiplication of costly response-to-social-problems programs, lend credence to the argument that many of our most pressing social problems have a cause-effect relationship with the quality and availability of adequate educational training.

So, as we look at the needs of education, we realize that neither the commitment to goals nor wise and sound planning nor willingness to invest generously in education—no one of these in itself—is sufficient. Rather, each is a vital component for which we are unlikely to find an acceptable substitute.

So, the time is now at hand to decide whether or not we are going to match our commitment to goals and our capabilities for planning and innovation with the dollar support. We must be willing to make a tremendous investment in education, and this investment cannot be a pittance. Even now, when we look at our total investment in education, I doubt if it could be called a token investment or pittance, because at the present time the state and local governments are spending more than $30 billion annually, and it is projected that by the year 1970 this expenditure will increase to where local and state public expenditures alone will be more than $40 billion, added to the private expenditures in education, plus whatever the federal government will spend.

At the present time, the federal government is spending for education—that is, for elementary and secondary and higher education—about $4.5 billion. However, the total of all federal government expenditures for education, research, and the overseas schools—the military, and so forth—is about $11 billion.

As soon as the war in Vietnam is over—and we hope and pray that will be in the not too distant future—I think we will break out of the problem that John Brademas mentioned: that there now seems to be an inability of the federal government to spend much more for education, and there is a sort of hold at the present level. I would expect that we would then see an immediate rise in appropriations for elementary and secondary education. Each year the needs are more tremendous. This is a growing and heterogeneous nation—more than 200 million people with diverse and rising individual aspirations. The people look at education in a new light. As one, they realize that they will benefit or suffer by their ability or inability to satisfy the education needs of our people. The enormity of the education task, coupled with the fact that time is running out, has rendered really academic the question of whether or not education is within the sphere of interest and a legitimate activity of the federal government.

It is expected that by 1975 we will need to spend from all sources at least $75 billion for education in order to meet the needs. This increase must come from the federal, the state, and the local levels—all three levels.

The federal government to date has provided a tremendous number of grant-in-aid programs. In fact, these programs have grown like Topsy. In June 1967, the Office of Economic Opportunity issued a 700-page catalog of federal assistance programs—a catalog which was outdated before it was published and in thickness alone rivals many of the largest metropolitan telephone directories, although it contains only a thumb-nail sketch of operative programs. Recently, Vice-President Humphrey attempted to facilitate understanding in this area, with the distribution of *The Vice-President's Handbook for Local Officials.* This is a 300-page document, which in essence is a guide to the guide for federal assistance.

Even if you are lucky enough to have both volumes, it is doubtful that you will have a practical and working understanding of our myriad of federal assistance programs. Any complete library would have to include each department's publication of programs within its jurisdiction. And it would also have to include, I believe, the 392-page document of grants-in-aid and other financial assistance programs administered by the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

All of this has become so complex and so time-consuming as to spawn a new species of professional—the grant-in-aid specialist whose business is that of keeping abreast of new programs and of changes in existing programs, which ones are getting more money this year and

which ones less. Rarely does he have to worry about the phasing out of programs. His status largely is determined by his proficiency in drafting project proposals that will bring the maximum number of federal dollars to his state or local employer.

The education profession recognizes the value of the services that this specialist can offer. It has expanded its ranks to include him and to reimburse him at an annual rate that would be the envy of a veteran classroom teacher and of many a career administrator.

The federal government is maturing rapidly from the stage of being a junior partner to a full senior partner status. With the states and local communities now as *associates,* the new senior partner is making judgments and policy decisions and exercising functions for which it does not have the expertise or ability. In short, it is performing in areas where the states and their municipalities could and can perform at a higher level of competence.

If we ever had any serious question about buying quality with money alone, our experience in Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act has proved that this is not possible.

To date, as we look at these federal assistance programs, we see most of them in the form of categorical grants-in-aid. This means that the federal government has identified certain phases of education deemed critical to the national interests and has earmarked funds for programs designed to strengthen and improve these areas.

Narrow in scope, funded on a short-term basis, sometimes requiring matching funds as a prerequisite of the federal assistance, the categorical grant-in-aid was initially conceived as a mechanism that would apply the financial muscle of the federal government to assist the states and local communities in meeting their obligations.

Through a liberal interpretation of what may be deemed in the best national interests or critical to the national interests, federal authorities have, in rapid succession, identified phase after phase and implemented program after program with substantial dollar assistance. This identification process, with its subsequent investments of personnel and financial resources, is in many ways equivalent to the establishment of nationwide educational priorities. By staking its claim in a growing number of educational endeavors, the federal government is assuming, for all practical purposes, the role of the primary educational decision-maker in the use of these funds.

State and local educators have been virtually denied any meaningful voice in this dialogue. Rather, they have been presented with a *fait accompli* and must try either to satisfy their particular needs within this framework or opt not to receive needed federal aid.

The categorical grant-in-aid has built-in deficiencies that place these subordinate partners at a further disadvantage. By virtue of their narrow dimensions, categorical grants can be awarded only for specific and limited purposes. State educational agencies and local school districts must attempt to accommodate a host of diverse community needs within these confining limitations. Absent is the degree of flexibility necessary to meet the special needs that the community has that do not fit into these categories.

In addition, the categorical grants tend to fragment any overall or integrated educational program. Emphasis at the state and local levels shifts to those specific areas in which the federal government has exhibited a genuine interest and a willingness to invest dollar aid. Planning is not only limited in breadth but also in time. Short-term planning follows in the wake of short-term authorizations and appropriations. Categorical grants are generally renewed and refunded on an annual basis. From one year to the next, state and local educators do not know whether or not funds will be available. And if funds are to be available, they do not know precisely how much they may expect to receive or when. Because no firm commitment can be made until the Congress has appropriated the requisite funds, planning tends to be sporadic, and on a hit-or-miss basis. In a word, educators have no lead time in planning. Long-term and intelligent planning gives way to eleventh-hour efforts that fail to make optimum use of resources and fail to provide the best possible educational experiences.

In recent testimony before the House Education and Labor Committee with regard to proposed amendments to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, educator after educator pleaded the case for sustained financial commitments that would pave the way for sound, long-range planning. Educator after educator argued for the need to streamline and to simplify the extremely cumbersome administrative process that accompanies the categorical grant.

Those charged with the responsibility of implementing educational programs at the state and local levels must, if they cannot afford the services of a full-time professional grant-in-aid specialist, devote an inordinate amount of time to satisfying federally-prescribed guidelines. Applications for proposed projects must be drawn up and submitted to the appropriate federal agencies and departments and must be followed by elaborate justifications, accountings, and evaluations. The costs of this type of administrative procedure are high. The waste in terms of talent and in terms of taxpayers' dollars defies precise calculation on a nationwide basis. In good conscience and in all honesty, should we expect the American taxpayer to foot the bill for this waste?

It is doubtful that the American taxpayer will write off this waste as a necessary byproduct of equal and excellent education. Poorer and smaller states and local educational agencies just do not have the manpower to satisfy federal paperwork requirements.

Matching requirements sometimes serve to broaden the gap that exists between the wealthy and the poor. Surely, the best interests of the individuals in the so-called poorer states are not served if that is the case.

As the federal government assistance brings this about, it has contributed to making the rich richer and the poor poorer. And this will not help in developing for the national well-being the best possible education for our young people.

So what we must then conclude is that the great expectations originally held out for this mode of federal financial assistance have not been met. We must, therefore, devise a more workable and more sound approach.

I believe that the block grant is the means that we must adopt. It will free us of some of the crippling deficiencies that we have seen in the categorical aid programs, some of which have brought confusion and a degree of centralization that runs contrary to the principles and practices that have been strongest in education. I believe the block grant would continue to return the needed revenue to the states and local communities, and I believe that we do not have to hold on to the categorical aid in order to build up support in the Congress.

We can't move immediately to a block grant for all education assistance that comes from the federal government; however, we can take a step at a time and do that which is necessary. Block grants would consolidate a number of present categorical aid programs and standardize the system of state participation. Most elementary and secondary education aids in the past have carried some state participation in their operation. The most glaring example of lack of state participation is in the present administration of Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. All Title III projects are developed locally and approved by the United States Office of Education. The projects, it is true, are reviewed by the state departments of education, but any state's recommendations are not necessarily followed. We adopted amendments in the first session of this Congress, which will change the operation of Title III of ESEA so that 75 percent of the money will go through state administration in 1969 and 100 percent of the new money through state administration in 1970. This means that all federal aid to elementary and secondary schools will now carry a degree of state participation and it will be easier to bring about a con-

solidation of the programs. I believe it would be wise as soon as possible to place Titles I, II, III, and V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and Title III-A of the National Defense Education Act into one block grant. In this way, each local school could devise a program enabling it to meet its needs for compensatory education, for education equipment and material, and for experimental and demonstration work. Each state would be required to devise a plan in which it would reach the school districts with the highest priorities with the money available and work out cooperative ventures for supplemental centers to improve the quality of education, to say nothing of upgrading its own department in its ability to plan on a long-term basis. A uniform formula also should be used for the block grant.

At the present time, Title III-A of NDEA provides for matching grants, with the greatest amount of money going to the poorest states—but that means the greatest amount of matching must come from them, as well.

As you know, Title I of ESEA provides for a school district entitlement, with the greatest amount of money going to the wealthiest states.

Title II of ESEA, while providing assistance in limited areas—library resources, textbooks, and instructional material—has, I believe, the best formula arrangement, as will the new amendments to Title III of ESEA, which now come the closest to allowing the states to exercise the functions that will build up a strong basis for decision-making and planning know-how.

It is now feasible to give greater leeway in the application of these funds, leeway that will enable state and the local education authorities to meet adequately their diverse and pressing locally-defined needs in each of these broad areas. The state and local educators could again exercise their legitimate function of establishing a hierarchy of educational priorities within each of these broad areas, and the priorities would be established on the basis of local community needs. State and local educators could again exercise this function, which is a unique and distinctive contribution that they must make to the education process.

The 1967 amendments to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act made an important improvement that should be incorporated in all federal educational laws—and that is forward funding. If the Congress would always authorize at least two years in advance, and if any amendments to the law would not apply to the next fiscal year but to the fiscal year thereafter, and if the Appropriations Committee this year would not only appropriate for the fiscal year 1969 but for 1970 as well, planning at the state and local level would be greatly

enhanced. The block grant approach would enhance long-range planning even more, to the extent that federal funding is now available to each local school district on a project-by-project basis, each school developing its grantsmanship, therefore making requests not only for what they need but for what they believe someone will approve. A change to funding on a program basis would enable the schools to make adjustments in their programming as the need arises rather than wait with fear and trepidation to see if each project receives an approval for next year's funding.

What is the current status of the block grant as a means for moving in the direction of more general aid to education? First of all, the proliferation of single categorical grant-in-aid programs and the serious problems inherent therein are not limited to the field of education. There may be some solace in knowing that the headache of dealing with this form of federal assistance goes beyond the education profession. More and more groups are clamoring for some relief—and quickly. The Congress has responded thus far by providing for more general and flexible support, as illustrated in The Partnership for Health amendments of 1967 and in the anticrime legislation that passed the House in August of last year.

Block grants were involved in the Vocational Education Act of 1963 —although not recognized nationally, as the issue was in 1967. The provisions of the Act of 1963 were written to update the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917 and the George-Barden Act of 1946 in order to assist and enable the states to meet their particular and pressing manpower needs within certain broadly defined limits that would guarantee that the national manpower needs would be satisfied simultaneously.

The Republicans in the House supported this proposal; the Democrats did not—in spite of the fact that it was advanced by a Democratic Administration. A compromise was finally reached. The categorical nature of the Smith-Hughes and George-Barden acts was retained, by and large. The new money for the 1963 Vocational Act was, in effect, a block grant—going through the state plans to be used by local communities for any type of training which would lead to gainful employment.

The U.S. Office of Education seems to agree with this approach, judging from its fact sheet on The Partnership for Learning and Earning Act of 1968.

Quoting from this fact sheet:

> The proposed legislation would remove the requirement for separate matching purpose-by-purpose and project-by-project and instead provide for

overall statewide matching. The proposal would provide more flexiblity in that varying proportions of federal funds could be used in matching state and local funds. Federal funds could then be directed to areas of greatest need.

On numerous occasions, President Johnson has cited the need and called for concerted efforts to consolidate existing grant programs. He has enlisted the services of the Bureau of the Budget to simplify the confusion in application requirements and in the funding and local reporting procedures as well. This was the explicit and implicit purpose behind my amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act Amendments of 1967—the so-called Quie Amendment.

Perhaps we are at last seeing the implementation of this Presidential request in the *packaging plan* which the U.S. Office of Education has developed and is now featuring. This packaging plan, if I understand it correctly, is designed to encourage state educational agencies to group many federal school aid applications into a single package for transmittal to the U.S. Office of Education—with an eye to eliminating some of the costly administrative red tape with which you are all undoubtedly familiar.

If the *truth-in-packaging* concept, which was intended to protect the consumer, could be applied to the U. S. Office of Education's packaging plan—it might have to be stamped or made to read "Attention: This packaging plan has the same purpose as the Quie Amendment." Be that as it may, I am delighted to have the Office of Education adopt some of my ideas. I understand, however, that they are experiencing some difficulties in ironing out some of the *minor technicalities.* In the finest of nonpartisan spirit, I shall be happy to work with OE officials—since I spent some time in thinking through these minor technicalities and in providing for smooth operations *before* I offered my amendment to ESEA.

I believe, then, that these consolidations of programs need to be made, and there should be other consolidations. I believe we need a new department—a Department of Education and Manpower Development—so we can bring the Department of Labor and the OEO and the OE manpower training programs and vocational education under one agency. [Applause] In this way, we could develop a national manpower policy.

Now, as we look at the problems of implementing block grants, I would like to touch on two of them—first, the problem of church-state relationship.

We surely do not want to raise the old religious wars again, which did so much to defeat federal aid to education in the past.

Speaking to the question of the private schools, I believe that an ingenious and highly acceptable means of assisting all students equitably was devised in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. All money in Title I and Title II would be made available to the students of both private and public schools. Any materials under Title II would be lent to the private schools, with ownership remaining in the public school system. A bypass was provided for students or localities which could not render materials to private schools for their children. Services were to be made available on an equitable basis. Either the public schools provided services not only to their own students needing compensatory education but to the private school children as well on an equitable basis or else the public school would not receive any funds. This has been implemented either as shared-time or else the public school actually places the services, such as remedial teachers, in the private schools to assist the needy students. This has brought about a close working relationship in most communities in the country between the public and private school personnel.

As I developed my block grant amendment, the same principle of public school administration and private school student and teacher participation applied to any grant of federal money.

I believe an expansion of this concept is the one that must be utilized because education is a national concern, a state responsibility, and a local function. As it is a national concern, we have a concern for all school children no matter where their parents have chosen that they should attend school.

The other difficulty that has been raised about the block grants is that of the large cities.

The large cities, with the center-city crisis, have a unique problem at this juncture in our history. Heretofore, the cities have been a source of wealth. In state aids, equalization formulas have taken from the cities and given to the outlying school districts of the state. Now that not only affluent people but industry as well have been moving out of the center city, these centers of population have not been faring as well in their ability to finance their education systems. Also, the re-districting by state legislatures to the principle or concept of "one man, one vote" is a recent happening.

The Ninth Annual Report of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations sums up the urban education dilemma in these terms:

In a study of the 37 largest standard metropolitan statistical areas in the country, it was shown that the state financial aid to local schools tended to favor suburban schools over central city schools: Hardly any states have revised their school aid formulas to recognize specifically that a much higher financial investment is required to educate disadvantaged children. Added costs accrue for smaller classes to assure more individualized attention, for keeping schools open longer hours, for offering additional recreational opportunities, and for measures required to compensate for an inadequate home environment.

The Commission's studies show that—

The schools serving low income central city children are receiving less per pupil as well as less per capita than those serving the more affluent suburbs. *It is the paradox of education in metropolitan America that where the needs are greatest, the resources are scarcest. The children needing education the most are receiving the least.*

We can handle this problem in two ways. Either the federal government can deal with the states to devise plans and to set priorities for the outlying areas of the state and deal with the large cities directly —or else we can assume that the states recognize the particular needs of the cities as the federal government does. Any reading of the national news should make the needs of the cities glaringly apparent, even to the least-informed. I would certainly choose the latter course of action. The federal government should deal with the 50 states, and the states, in turn, must devise plans and set priorities to deal with all of their needs, both urban and rural. I believe it would be a weakening of our federal system to begin the concept of "city states." Seventy percent of our population resides in our metropolitan areas. By 1975, it is expected that 80 percent will reside there. Surely, these people will have a political impact on the states as well as on the federal government.

American federalism and American education are at the crossroads. The future of American federalism and the future of American education cannot be predicted on the basis of what has survived or transpired, for in both, the past is not prologue. What path each will follow and what role the federal, state, and local partners will play is being evolved now. All of you will play as major or as minor a role in this determination as you may wish. As individuals who are the closest to the education pulse, I hope that you will assert yourselves. In education, it will be a question not only of who *can* accept and meet our greatest social responsibility—the education of our people—but who *will.* [Applause]

Discussion

PRESIDENT CURTIS: Congressman Brademas, I now invite you back to the rostrum for a brief rebuttal.

CONGRESSMAN BRADEMAS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I think you will have noticed that although Mr. Quie and I have a number of differences, some of which I am going to say a word about in a minute, we are at the same time very much in agreement in a number of areas. I was especially pleased that Al started out by asking the question, Will we match our commitment to our goals in education with dollars? and by saying that we will require a much larger investment in education if we are to meet these goals.

I for one want to issue a caveat to those who assume that as soon as the Vietnam war is over we will suddenly invest large sums of money on meeting our domestic problems such as education. For I fear that—and I predict this to you now—as soon as the war is over, there will be a stampede for a massive tax cut and that, unless there is a great effort of political will on the part of the leaders in American education, we are not likely to see the infusion of federal funds—especially federal funds in education that many of you, I think, are counting on.

One matter I was somewhat puzzled about, however, was Al's last point: he recited what he described as a paradox in American education, that where the needs are the greatest, the money is the least, namely, in the field of our urban areas. I don't think that is a paradox at all, nor do I think that the proposal that he makes for resolving that paradox is likely to do anything but exaggerate it.

In most states of our country there is no constitutional prohibition against a progressive income tax. Yet, I don't see candidates for governor or candidates for the state senate or the state house of representatives out on the hustings urging a progressive income tax analogous to the federal government's income tax, and doing so on the proposition that they want to raise money to help meet the pressing needs of education in the ghettos of our country. The political muscle is no longer in center city: it is out in the suburbs. That is where the votes are.

Consequently, to adopt the suggestion that all we have to do to solve the problems of the urban ghetto schools is to give a lot of federal money to the state education agencies and then assume that they will funnel those funds—if they follow the pattern of the past—into the areas of greatest need is, I think, only to hope for the impossible.

I cite you the situation in Chicago, Illinois, where there is enormous disparity between the amount of money spent in differing kinds of

areas in the same county. It is not enough to say one man, one vote will solve the problem, because the effect of legislative reapportionment in many of the state legislatures of our country has not been to increase the political power of the central cities but rather to increase the power of the suburbs. And there you are in the same cycle again.

We can say what we like. We can say we will not worry about that. That is a mean and ugly and difficult problem—and it is. And we can bury our heads in the sand, ostrichlike, and hope it will go away. But it won't go away, and you are the people who will have to be living with that problem. So I suggest to you that if you are putting all of your eggs in the basket of block grants, we are in for even more profound and, I would say, catastrophic trouble in the urban ghetto schools of this country.

I was very glad to see the emphasis that Al placed on consolidation programs in vocational education as well as other areas. I indicated in my remarks that I strongly support the streamlining and consolidation. One of the problems is that we get into semantic difficulties when we try to distinguish between categorical and block grants. Al suggested that categorical aid was narrow in scope, confining, limiting, inflexible. Let me give you an example of the most important act that we passed in Congress last year that moves in the direction of consolidating programs, the Education Professions Development Act, of which Al Quie and I happen to be bipartisan cosponsors. The purpose of this legislation is to bring together the wide spectrum of teacher-training programs, such as NDEA fellowships and institutes and the teacher fellowship program, the Teacher Corps program, all of those programs that, in any way, impinge upon the training of educational personnel, not only teachers but also guidance and counseling personnel and school administrators.

Now, this is a categorical program. It is aimed, if you please, at providing more training of educational personnel. That is the category which the program represents, but is there a person in this audience tonight who will be willing to stand up and say we don't need to train more Americans in the field of education? We have all the teachers we need. We have all the trained school superintendents and school administrators we need. We don't need any more guidance and counseling personnel. We don't need to upgrade the training of our educational people across this country.

I dare say there is not one. Therefore, I make the point that to have a categorical program in no way means that the program must be narrow and inflexible and restrictive in scope.

I want to make just one more point because Mr. Quie dwelt on it a

good deal, and that is the question of grantsmanship. If I understood him correctly, when he offers a block-grant proposal, he does not propose to do away with grants. He is going to have you go down to the state capitol rather than write a letter to the Office of Education.

Now, that may be better in some states—I am sure—but, I am acquainted with more than one school superintendent who does not regard with joy the prospect of putting his entire life in the hands of his chief state school officer.

I will go a step further. I know this is going to shock some of you, but it is late at night and some of you are asleep. I have even heard of elected chief state school officers who are contemplating running for governor of their state. And I know of some states in which an elected chief state school officer with his eye on the governor's office might just say to himself, "Oh, I love that block-grant approach. You just let me have all those nice juicy federal dollars and let me have them maybe a year or two before the state primary and let me decide where those dollars, those millions of dollars flooding into my state, are going to be used, and I will tell you who will be nominated governor of this state."

A lot of people haven't thought about that. A colleague of mine once said, "The joy of the block-grant approach is that you can be for the goodies for the folks back home, but you don't have to vote for the taxes that provide them."

It is a wonderful way to operate. I don't regard it as a responsible way to operate.

Let me make a final comment, if I may. The needs of American education are so great, the needs are so complex that I hope very much that the future shape of funding for American schools will find not contention but cooperation, and cooperation among school officials at every level of our government—federal, state, and local. The task is much too vast for any single level of our government to insist that only it should have any voice. I think this is a charge to you who are the leaders of American education. Perhaps this is a good time to remind ourselves of it. I do not forget the words of John F. Kennedy in his great 1963 message to Congress on education, when he said, "Education is the keystone in the arch of freedom and progress."

You as the school administrators of our country are certainly the shapers of that stone. [Applause]

MR. CURTIS: Now, a final word from Congressman Quie.

CONGRESSMAN QUIE: We do get into quite a bit of semantics when we talk about categorical aid versus block grants for education. That is

a category in itself. The block grant is a category in itself. It can't be used by the states for garbage removal. We have categories and we are trying to block some of these categories to help save some of the red tape and the paperwork and to make certain that the state is involved in determining policies or setting priorities within the state.

As I mentioned in my comments, the cities do have a unique problem at this juncture in history. I think it will be resolved some time in the future. There isn't enough political muscle in the ghettos of the cities. That is going to change. It is changing. The people who are in the ghettos of the cities now are learning how to assert themselves politically, and they will learn more and more as each summer goes by. I hope they do it by legitimate means rather than in terms of what one usually thinks of as a "hot summer."

Other people before—from Europe mostly—who did not have a political club at first gained it. Anyone who doesn't believe it knows what happened in Boston. They were fearful of the Irish. But they have a lot of political club in Boston. It has gone a little further than Boston of late.

I see the thing happening to the people who inhabit the ghettos of the city, who are exercising some effort on their own part to gain recognition. We are electing Negro mayors—and John Brademas can be rightly proud of one of them—and they are now finding their way into the political world in America. But, as the suburbs under one person, one vote have gained more strength and the central city has not, the same thing has occurred in Congress. The suburbs have gained in political strength in the Congress, and the rural areas really have more of an impact throughout the entire nation in Congress than they do in the state. In some states they do not have as much impact as the cities because of the predominance of the city. New York State is a good example of the dominance of a large city.

Illinois is another example, the dominance of Chicago in the politics of that state. No one would question the dominance of Chicago in the politics of Illinois right now.

The comment that under block grants you can be for all the goodies for the folks back home but you don't have any responsibility for the taxes, the same criticism can be made for categorical aid. You can be in favor of all the goodies of categorical aid, too, and not be responsible for any of the taxes raised on the federal level. This is another evolution of our federal system. At one time in America we had a local form of government, where the township, county, and municipal government existed and where people solved their problems and raised taxes to solve their problems. The people elected had a joint responsibility for the programs and for raising the taxes. There were state

programs that raised taxes and expended them for the programs of the state. And the federal government took care of the national effort. That mixture has changed. No longer can local communities raise the money themselves to solve their problems. You can't furnish an adequate education on the property tax.

There are some states that find it impossible to raise enough money for an adequate education system. Most of the states, however, could, if they would put their minds to it; however, they have turned to the federal government for financial assistance. The federal government won't reduce that financial assistance; that will never come about. You won't find any of the school board members seated here or back home who will say, "Let's stop the federal aid money; we will raise the property tax."

You won't find a state legislator who will say, "Stop the federal money; we will raise the income tax and sales tax and pay for it ourselves."

And you will find very few members of Congress saying, "Let's stop the federal money coming into my Congressional district." It is all right to stop it in other districts, not in his.

The federally-impacted-area assistance needs to be changed, but we can't change it because there are more than a majority of members of the Congress who have a substantial amount of federal aid expended in their districts.

One of the most conservative members of the Congress votes for it all the time because he gets $3 million in his district all the time.

Politically and humanely the federal government has assumed this burden of raising money for education. Now, let's find the best possible means in which we can share in developing the best educational system, assuming that education is a local function, a state responsibility, and a federal concern. And I think to move toward the block grant is the way to do it.

We have states that need to gain the ability to assume this responsibility themselves. But I would much prefer to give states the resonsibility and work with them as a state office of education works with them in the development of their state plan than to say, "Let's wait until they some day grow up and can assume that responsibility."

I compare that to raising children. Some children accept responsibility right off and can raise the rest of the children in the family. Others are not able to accept responsibility; you wait until they are 11 before you give it to them; you give it to them and work more closely with them so they can assume responsibility. To become the kind of adults we need for America they must learn how to accept responsi-

bility. Likewise, the states in administering federal money in education can actually do the most competent job for the youth of their state as they also learn to accept the responsibility of setting priorities at the state level that reach the areas of greatest need. That is why I believe strongly the next shift needs to be made toward block grants in education in order that states and the local units of government can assume more responsibility than they have at the present time under categorical aids. [Applause]—*Sixth General Session, February 19, 1968.*